



Town of Arlington, Massachusetts
730 Massachusetts Ave., Arlington, MA 02476
Phone: 781-316-3000

webmaster@town.arlington.ma.us

Minutes 02/26/2009

Commissioners Present: B. Cohen, A. Frisch, M. Kramer, D. Levy, S. Makowka, M. Penzenik, T. Smurzynski, J. Worden

Commissioners Not Present: M. Hope Berkowitz, J. Hindmarsh, M. Potter

Guests Present: J. Egan, S. Stafford, J. Salocks, L. Carlson Hill, B. Rehrig, S. Rehrig, C. Lockery, M. Brooks, D. Cerundolo, Z. Garfall, N. Svencer, R. Ivers, M. Dempsey, R. Baxter, A. LeRoyer

1. Meeting Opens

8:00pm

2. Appointment of Alternate Commissioners: B. Cohen (For 187 Lowell Street only), A. Frisch, S. Makowka, T. Smurzynski appointed to Mt. Gilboa/Crescent Hill Historic District Commission; A. Frisch, D. Levy, S. Makowka, appointed to Pleasant Street Historic District Commission

3. Approval of Minutes from January 22, 2009. S. Makowka moved tabling minutes until next month, seconded by J. Worden, all voted in favor.

4. Communications

- a. Email re: 187 Lowell Street (Barkan)
- b. Request for CONA for 30-32 Jason Street (Mallia)
- c. Letter re: 187 Lowell Street (Hill)
- d. Application for 21 Central Street (Dyer) re: Solar Panel Installation
- e. Supplemental Submission for Proposed Development for 187 Lowell Street
- f. Letter from Salocks/Stafford re: 187 Lowell Street
- g. Letter from Lockery re: 187 Lowell Street

5. Other Business

- a. J. Worden reported on request from Budget Committee for recommendation for next year's budget. Also reported that there were no new applications for the Preservation Loan Program.
- b. M. Penzenik reported that she had visited a Pleasant Street house we had previously approved and she suggested in the future that we be sure to clearly specify historically appropriate features such as sills in our certificates. S. Makowka agreed we should look at sills, corner boards, etc. when issuing certificates and use correct verbiage to be sure final results are in keeping with the Commission's goals.
- c. S. Makowka passed around a handout containing the standard language to be used for motions, including: 1) approval with modifications, 2) denial of a project with specific reasons for denial, 3) amendment to denial – provision where we can issue denial but give an idea of what modifications would be required to underlying project to make acceptable, if applicant submits new application encompassing those changes within 14 days it would be approved.

6. New Business

Hearings

8:20pm

S. Makowka announced that the Commission would take hearings slightly out of the order listed in the agenda so that we could focus on the potentially long discussion of the 187 Lowell application at the end of the other hearings and so we would not require those applicants to remain for the entire hearing.

- a. Formal Hearing re: 28 Academy Street (Rehrig) Brian & Sheila Rehrig were present to discuss the proposed project to substantially renovate the interior of their house including changes to the kitchen and bath which would

require some exterior changes. These changes include: replacement of a couple of windows and relocation of a back door on the rear elevation; replacement of aluminum storm windows currently used to enclose an original sleeping porch on second story of house (visible from street) with real wooden double hung sashes similar to windows on rest of house. The applicant explained that they are proposing, on the longer side of the porch, to add 1 larger 2 over 2 window in the middle with smaller 1 over 1 windows on either side. He stated that this design echoes the existing bay next to porch and that they haven't specified the actual windows yet. M. Penzenik inquired about the change from 3 windows of same size, to the proposed sizing. The applicant responded that no where else on the house were there 3 windows of equal size. M. Penzenik suggested making all of the windows on the long side of the porch the same size which she feels looks more natural to be same size as others on house. Applicants stated that they prefer what was presented, but were open to suggestions on window manufacturers. They were concerned that if they used same sized windows, they would have to be all 1 over 1.

The Applicant also mentioned the addition of an exterior AC unit that would not be visible from street. There is an existing AC unit and they plan to add a 2nd one next to it, both to be enclosed with lattice panels similar to lattice on porch. (Existing AC unit is already enclosed with lattice)

Applicant next described request to remove existing chimney which is located at the rear of the house in order to accommodate interior renovations. S. Makowka clarified that the existence of a chimney on a house of this era would be considered an important visual feature and would typically be retained or replicated, however, in this case, there exists a second chimney at the front part of the house in a more visually prominent position. S. Makowka moved that the Pleasant Street HDC having fully reviewed the application before it, finds that the project under consideration, if constructed according to the plans submitted therewith for replacement of windows on screen porch and installation of 2 AC units and removal of chimney, would be in harmony and not incongruous with the historical and architectural values of the district. Seconded by J. Worden for discussion. D. Levy said he would prefer same size windows, but could live with either way. S. Makowka modified his motion to allow applicants to adjust to 3 like size windows and specified that any windows be approved by the monitor prior to being installed. Seconded by A. Frisch. S. Makowka, J. Worden, A. Frisch, and D. Levy voted in favor. M. Penznik and M. Kramer opposed. Motion to approve certificate passed 5 to 2. Monitor appointed S. Makowka

b. Formal Hearing re: 179 Westminster Avenue (Cerundolo). D. Cerundolo gave presentation regarding materials in the application. The house is currently a 2 family and a big part of the proposed changes on the exterior would be converting current deck and adding a covered porch. The house itself is a Worker Victorian built in 1881 and is very simple compared to other homes in neighborhood. The bay on side is a later addition and the current deck is not particularly aesthetic. The goal of the applicant is to try to restore the house and make the home look more appealing. The 2nd change is to expand the stairway which would involve adding a bay to the left side of the home. The current stairway very narrow and it is very difficult to get things upstairs. The Commissioners cautioned that this is a very important house and that the applicant should not push forward too fast if they are at all unsure about the resulting outcomes. The applicant stated that the proposed opening of the stairway would be more welcoming and make for a nicer foyer area when entering the home. Also, the applicant stated that the windows would have to be replaced since several of them were in very poor condition. In response to Commission questions, the applicant clarified that some of windows on the 2nd floor were probably original, but not the ones on the first floor. M. Penzenik asked if they looked into windows being repaired. The Applicant replied that they had not yet since their goal is to get master plan in motion. J. Worden gave applicant information re: restoration of wood windows.

S. Makowka stated that it's hard to know exactly what's happening from the application. He suggested setting the issue of siding aside for time being. Regarding the stairway, S. Makowka asked about why proposed bay roof is so steep (unlike the slope on the existing bay roof on the front of the house. The applicant suggested that they wanted the new porch to mimic the bay on other side of the house as much as possible and, if height is an issue, they can take it a little bit. B. Cohen asked about bays on other side and indicated that she was inclined to suggest squaring it off the proposed bay rather than clipping the corners.

The Commission next indicated that the proposed window pattern on the new bay would be an issue since the rise around the bay, following the rise of the interior stairs creating a "turret-like" effect. The view presented is not a historical interpretation on a bay for this period a building. More appropriate would be to put them in line with each other and perhaps do fancy things with stained glass, etc. In any case, this style of house would not originally have done what is proposed with the windows. B. Cohen suggested that the applicant revisit the whole bay concept. In response to a question about timing, the applicant explained that they planned to start doing renovation in the spring, but that they while they don't want to rush it, they do want to get moving on it. S. Makowka proposed continuing the hearing to a later date since, given the number of suggestions for changes, the Commission will need to see additional materials and plans to be able to vote on a modified project. Applicant agreed that they would like to continue hearing to future date. A. Frisch asked about the appropriateness of having a Craftsman style peak on wrap around porch and B. Cohen replied that her house has a similar feature and it works OK. S. Makowka commented that he views the proposed trusses on the porch as being from the wrong time period. He suggested doing it in a more stick style.

Certain Commission members suggested that the proposed Arts & Crafts style proposed was too late for this particular house. Applicant suggested that 161 Westminster Ave. looks like what she suggested.

J. Worden asked about the design of the front stairs coming down from the porch. He commented that it looks very fortress like and questioned what material was being proposed. Applicant answered that it is currently brick but they had not finalized plans for the stairs. S. Makowka reminded them that they would need more specifications in the future on this feature. S. Makowka encouraged the Applicant to think hard about windows on the bay, maybe in line, fewer windows, and square versus angled on bay. In addition, roof height of bay and design of front porch are areas that need attention. S. Makowka asked for continuance and applicant agreed. J. Worden suggested that the Applicant might want to visit the March 13 & 14th Traditional Home Show at Hynes Auditorium for additional information on available options.

c. Continuation of Formal Hearing re: 81 Westminster. Application was not present but had indicated to the Exec. Sec. that he planned to refile for a certificate of non-applicability. S. Makowka indicated that absent a formal withdrawal, the Commission needed to act on the application still before it and suggested that it be denied on procedural grounds. S. Makowka moved that the project be denied based on the lack of sufficient information to make a decision at this point. Seconded J. Worden, Roll Call Vote on Denial motion: T. Smurzynski, M. Kramer, M. Penzenik, D. Levy, S. Makowka, A. Frisch, J. Worden voted to in favor of denial motion. None opposed.

d. Continuation of Formal Hearing re: 187 Lowell Street. M. Penzenik recused herself. B. Cohen acted as Commissioner for the purposes of this hearing with A. Frisch, M. Kramer, D. Levy, S. Makowka, T. Smurzynski, and J. Worden.

S. Makowka noted for the record that the Commission had received a supplemental submission from applicant responding to the feedback and comments from last month's hearing. It was noted for the record that numerous communications from interested parties had been received. S. Makowka suggested that the applicants give a presentation of their supplemental submission and then he would like to talk about some of the design elements on the houses, get some feedback from Commission and then open it up to the audience.

Atty. William Dillon summarized the supplemental materials and touched on 2 items – historic lotting of property and density characteristics of district. The 187 Lowell property is roughly the lower half of the 2 lots as shown on presentation board. Characteristics of overall subdivision generally follow long thin lotting with long, deep widths. In particular, the 187 site was originally contemplated to be 2 lots. Crescent Park was unique concept in public open space idea and there is not any clear intent from lotting to establish private open space or large lots. In fact there was a prohibition in original subdivision to owning more than 3 lots without building on them. The tendency was to create denser subdivision with public open space. However, the original subdivision was a failure. It was foreclosed upon and that led to almost identical plan which also languished until 1885 for development. In 1885 Thomas Elder came on scene and drastically reduced lot sizes. Larger lots were halved, some to less than 6,000 feet. Most relevant, he undertook specific subdivisions in area including these two lots (showed overlay) on which a subdivision road and 5 lots were created.

In 1889 public sewers put in and number of homeowners subdivided their lots. Those subsequent subdivisions were apparently successful and the lots were sold. The other point to emphasize is the density characteristics of the District. We did an analysis of every house in district based on assessor's records and determined the average lot size and floor area ratio (FAR) which is a tool for measuring density relative to lot area. The District average FAR is .3, and the 3 proposed houses are .24 to .27.

S. Makowka asked for existing density for lot 187 – Atty. Dillon said he'll get answer, didn't have right now.

Atty Dillon continued: The second table to emphasize was specifically designed to address one of the Commission criteria for new construction -- the lateral spacing of houses on street. The averages in District range from 21 – 39 feet and the proposed range from 20-51 feet.

A. Frisch noted that according to the deed you have one amount of land but other Town records have different amounts – so could it be that you are underestimating which could throw off the FAR? Atty. Dillon replied that there may be some difference, but we don't think it is drastically understated. He stated that they had used assessor's records in their submission.

B. Cohen asked if the house was built before or after the subdivision. Atty. Dillon stated that the house was built in 1884 which is after the 1882 subdivision. S. Stafford said she has record of Arlington Advocate referencing building house in 1882. S. Makowka asked that she provide a copy of the article for the record. B. Cohen noted that existing

House was built on top of the original lot line. Atty. Dillon agreed, he said his assumption is that someone bought 2 lots and built the house in the middle.

S. Makowka noted that on original 2 lots--the bottom half is the existing 187 lot--those lots have 4 houses on them: 3 houses plus 1 converted carriage house. However, B. Cohen noted that there is no record of when the two lots in question got subdivided and re-subdivided. S. Makowka noted that we have an 1889 map of Arlington Heights showing 3 major houses: including the existing 187 Taylor House. Atty. Dillon emphasized that contemporaneously, other founders of district were viewing the 2 lot strips as opportunities to make greater density. S. Makowka noted that the FAR calculations presented were averages of information that reflect quite a variety across the District which is indicative of diversity of the development styles, some dense, some not so dense. The purchaser of 187 took 2 lots, built house in middle of 2 lots clearly thinking how they wanted that lot to be -- not 5 houses around the perimeter. The 2 lots (now 187) exemplify that diversity. B. Cohen agreed, stating that the house was in the middle and on a pedestal and so the owner was clearly not intending to subdivide the lot. M. Kramer stated that there was a severe financial crisis in this time period of the early 1880s -- there were a series of financial crises. Atty. Dillon suggested that that might have been the reason to subdivide for financial reasons. The failure of underlying plan and need to make smaller lots was probably a product of that change. B. Cohen added that Thomas Elder worked as a conductor on trolley, so he was a working class person. He created this association and a lot of his friends bought the houses.

S. Makowka noted that the submission contained a table comparing the proposed houses to the approved development at 151 Lowell Street, however, he pointed out that the footprint of that house is quite different. The 3 proposed houses with addition have footprints of 1936 feet for the Westerly house, 1450 existing house with addition, and 1552 for easterly house but the house at 151 Lowell Street was only 1120 feet. T. Smurzynski stated that, in addition, most other houses along Lowell Street have footprints of about 1000 sf. S. Makowka said 2 original lots were what size? -- W. Dillon said incrementally they changed -- 1 on right was 39,800, and on left was 28,920.

S. Makowka noted that the submission contained legal memos about the appropriate legal standards for the Commission to be looking at and there were a couple of mentions of marketability and feasibility. He asked Atty. Dillon if it was his opinion that that was a criteria that by statute is important for the Commission to consider here? Atty. Dillon responded that the memo was intended to cover case law which governs consideration of open space issue, noting that is not a permissible criteria for the Commission to consider open space per se, although it is appropriate the size and shape of the lot in relation to the house and the relationship to the lot and the other structures in the vicinity. The alternatives analysis only intended to address relative question of what is best thing for lot, the mix of what can be build, refurbish, leave alone, etc. So, feasibility is not a criteria, but it may be relevant to the Commission to consider that a denial doesn't ensure that nothing is built on the lot.

S. Makowka then stated that he had searched MLS to pull down all the sales in Arlington over the past three months, noting there's quite a range of sizes that have sold but the average single family house sold in Arlington 2088 square feet, and the median was 1764. There is a wide range from 4000 down to 768 square feet but he did not want the record to reflect that things don't sell in Arlington below a certain size. Atty Dillon responded that feasibility might have been a better word. Thinking around square footage that from developer's perspective, land, construction, carry cost, mix of elements yields a certain area of return and this is where they come to their conclusion for feasibility.

J. Worden asked if the applicant was suggesting that every time a builder buys a property he has the right to make a profit on it. Atty. Dillon responded no. J. Worden continued to ask why the Procedural History 2003-2009 in the supplemental submission omitted 2 attempts of Applicant to bypass the Commission to go to Board of Selectmen for street layout and also used 1 attempt to use the demolition delay bylaw. Atty. Dillon said there was no intent to omit them. They were just trying to get a concise procedural timeline. He stated that Town officials had talked to them about coming in to this Commission to work things out, suggesting that one viable route was to put best foot forward. Upon inquiry, Atty. Dillon identified only a single Town official (Town Counsel John Maher) as having made such a suggestion. S. Makowka noted that, in any case, the Commission's complete timeline is reflected in the minutes over time.

C. Reitzel, 80 Westminster Ave., discussed why we have a historic district in this part of Town, not in every area of Town. This particular property is worthy of preservation by itself. S. Makowka noted that M. Dempsey had sent a letter to the Commission with several informational attachments. He noted that the house is sited directly in center of lots 1 and 2. He also confirmed that O'Leary family lived there since 1900. He had found a deed transfer from Butler to O'Leary family, where it stayed until 2003 when it was sold in an estate settlement.

S. Makowka asked the applicant to move to a discussion of the houses themselves. S. Makowka asked if anything being altered on existing structure -- R. Botterio said that an ell was being added on the back of the original building.

S. Makowka noted that the ell was offset from the main house slightly and asked if this would this be a typical type of addition for this period. B. Cohen said probably not unless perhaps the brother's family got stuck in the back. She

continued, the existing house is 1900 sq feet, and the addition brings the house up to 3000 so this is a very large addition. R. Botterio confirmed that the material specs were in the application material.

T. Smurzynski observed that one thing we have to consider is the size of house. The proposal is to add two houses that are larger than anything in the neighborhood and then we are ballooning the existing house to fit the two new houses, rather than as additions that come in at same size and scale of house. One of the things that it is important to consider is whether the additional structures are consistent with what is already there. On the contrary, here the existing house is being added to in order to raise it to the level of the proposed new houses. B. Cohen asked about hypothetically coming in to ask to build gigantic addition on house (forgetting about 2 new houses being added). R. Botterio suggested looking at the project as a progression of individual houses taken as a collective. B. Cohen reiterated that even alone the size of the addition to the main house is a concern. She has no objection to putting an addition, however, this addition looks like a little cape that got its roof kicked out because of the shed dormer thing.

S. Makowka asked the applicant to turn to the other houses. R. Botterio described the building to right of existing house. It was built to look like it might have been a carriage house. There is a lot of variety in the area so the goal was to have it fit in to neighborhood but did not necessarily want to mimic Taylor House, the intent was just to do something different. Makowka asked if there was a precedent for this size and style of a carriage house in Arlington? Ms. Cohen noted one example in Newton that she is aware of, but that was a carriage house for a full blown estate with a Victorian mansion, which is not the situation found here. S. Makowka said he reads the plans as having carriage house doors on 3 different facades. R. Botterio replied that suggested reuse of existing doors from other places to break up big masses of wall, however, they don't function as doors. B. Cohen replied that that gets us back to the fact that this is a massive house. R. Botterio admitted that they are all big houses.

S. Makowka stated that there is precedent in Arlington for having a carriage houses with these design cues. However, this particular structure does not read this way because the large roof structure behind gets in the way of the front façade and gives a different interpretation with how that reacts with existing house. There are a lot of complicated roof lines in back. R. Botterio replied that the fronts were all meant to be narrow compared to backs of houses. R. Rowland said the rear portion is set back so you are only interpreting the front part from the street. B. Cohen asked about the use of three skylights. R. Botterio suggested they were to add light since there were not a lot of windows on the house.

R. Botterio described proposed structure on the left. Applicant has made some changes. The intent is to be similar to the original but not in exactly the same style of Queen Anne. So the proportions are similar and the siting is up high because of topography of land. S. Makowka asked about detail of railing between posts in front of front door instead of stairs. R. Botterio said that the stairs go to side because driveway on side. Per the Commissioners question, Mr. Rowland confirmed that the peak of this house on lot 1 to left is lower than the existing Taylor House. He stated that they have reduced the peak, now it is a little lower. They have also re-oriented the left hand house so that it is more inline. J. Worden asked about the setback from the rear. Rowland stated that the rear yard setback was 23'8" from the patio and suggested that pushing the house back would make the front steps would be more dramatic due to grade. There was a discussion of opportunities to grade yard to lower building back relative to the front façade of Taylor House.

R. Botterio continued that they had changed the left facing facade. The original first floor roofline going straight across was for decoration, they liked it better without it and removed it. S. Makowka said looking from front of house looking at the roof on either side of the front gable hard to compare on the plans but he was concerned that the front roofline was shown to be in 2 different planes on the front of house. That is, for the sake of the record, the roofline to left of the front gable is different from the roofline to right of front gable. R. Botterio continued that that element was necessitated by stairway location. He continued to describe porch off master bedroom and the bay on the back of the house.

S. Makowka opened floor to questions – M. Penzenik, 52 Melrose St., Arlington, having recused herself from Commission and speaking as audience member commented that regarding the existing house, additions may have occurred over time. However, she is concerned that for all you can hardly tell that some of these elevations are from the same structure. Her concern is that these are going to look like "McMansions" and wants to make it clear that the Commission has to look closely at choices of materials so we don't have that characteristic. Further she doesn't understand why house is so gigantic on the right. Given relationship to existing houses, she feels it looks like a hotel. That really needs to be addressed. On original house, this looks like a really bad addition. In part it has to do with the fact that it looks like a cape with 2 shed dormers which appears insensitive to existing house. For example, the plans for the addition disregard the beautiful detailing on rakes of the original, and she don't understand why the plans didn't pick those up and apply to addition. R. Botterio replied that they were trying not to copy the main structure but had been back and forth on that.

M. Dempsey, 123 Westminster stated that the houses as proposed were too large for neighborhood. They dwarf what exists in neighborhood. 151 and 157 Lowell are large houses – 151 is quite large for neighborhood. Those are far

away and in between are many smaller houses. He can see the spacing on west side working much better, but on the east side spacing is problematic. Where sited, perhaps this is the best possible given the constraints they had to deal with. He noted that there is something potentially separate being proposed in the back. He is concerned what houses look like from the street. Yes larger than other houses but left hand house is more proportionally to land so it works.

He suggested that it is important to recognize that if back gets developed it creates a situation where the rest of the house can never be separated again because of zoning. S. Stafford, 203 Lowell Street inquired regarding grading, what would be done and how it will impact these houses. R. Botterio replied that they are digging out basements but plan to keep front area completely untouched except for driveway. N. Svencer, 197 Lowell Street, stated that T. Smurzynski's point about adding to original house to justify the 2 larger properties is very important. The massive size of the houses bothers everyone.

J. Salocks, 203 Lowell Street, noted that the applicant did great job using numbers to quantify the specifications of the house, lots, FAR, etc, but the key issue here is quality which isn't addressed. This house is built in middle of 2 lots, and simply making this lot look more like the rest of district takes away unique historic quality completely. He has taken a picture and has replicated Taylor House – showing a board with the 2 proposed houses side by side with the original. S. Stafford stated that the development of this area was significant and that the existing diversity is significant. She read from the Mt Gilboa District report: "Historic district protection will ensure that the existing unique homes will be preserved and, hopefully, enhanced in a manner which respects the original spirit and character." She questions if the proposal preserves or enhances the spirit or character of original property. In her opinion it does not in that it dramatically alters this view from Lowell Street. A. LeRoy, 12 Peirce St., VP Arlington Land Trust, wanted to take opportunity to support Sharon's overall site assessments. It is a unique property in the Mt Gilboa district. L. Carlson Hill, 175 Lowell Street, wants to acknowledge this is a passion for a lot of people, but hopes it can be a collaboration on preservation. The goal is to preserve what you can and consider the alternatives and what impacts our life. Maybe denial of this specific proposal but if changed to suggested option, to go forward would be best. If something is preserving the front siting with the land, and it is not offensive, we are supportive of houses being built. M. Brooks, 110 Crescent Hill Ave., 40B thing is the elephant in the room. Developer must have known in district when he bought property in district. Atty Dillon replied that 40B is a possibility for this site and the developer could have gone that route a long time ago. He suggested that if they didn't do that, someone else could, however, this is the project the developer wants to build.

S. Makowka noted that procedurally we have to make a decision tonight unless we ask for another extension of time.

He asked the Commissioners for their take on the proposal as it stands. T. Smurzynski expressed concern about large addition of existing house, and the massive size of westerly building. He suggested instead a smaller addition and a smaller house on that side. M. Kramer has similar feelings and having driven by and stopped recently, this house was probably considered a "McMansion" at its time of erection. Perhaps a carriage house could be more in conformance with the architecture and could be decreased in size with Westerly house. D. Levy thanked Jeff for putting this picture together (the depiction showing three side by side Taylor house site on lot). He does think houses built on here would be appropriate, but also this also tells us that the houses proposed are way too big. He suggested reducing the addition on other house, and bringing the other houses to scale. In summary, he feels that there is lots of work to be done still. B. Cohen said agrees that the visual is powerful. Never against 2 houses, but "McMansions" bothers her and the addition looks like a kicked out cape.

A. Frisch indicated that he could envision other houses, but does have problem with scale of the proposed houses as applied to Town in general. The site would have a lot more open feel to it if we were looking at three 2,000 sf houses.

He would like to see the whole scale brought down to Arlington scale. J. Worden agrees that the photograph depiction was powerful. He has gone over the plans in detail, and came to the reluctant conclusion that it might be viable to do something on this site, however, the right hand house is too big, too close, and too inappropriate. It may be possible to somewhere on that site put up a small carriage house with a foot print of say, 600sf. He originally thought house on left could be OK if the addition was swung the other way on the old house, but given revised plans and the model, the house on the left seem just too big and needs to be dramatically scaled back. S. Makowka thanked applicant for providing information and indicated that he believes they have heard some of the feedback from the Commission. Considering the house on the left, he noted that it is very long and the footprint is large, although in part, this appears to have been done in an effort to keep the front façade small and to provide a step back on 2nd story. Regarding the addition on original house, he noted that a large addition could work if designed sympathetically to the original structure. He noted two examples – house on Pleasant Street that was moved from its original location on Broadway was resited and a large ell addition was constructed in the rear. Other Commissioners noted that there was also a large addition approved for a structure in the Broadway District. S. Makowka summarized that the applicant's attempt to make this proposed addition more nondescript seems to have resulted in something that is maybe not the right addition for this house. He expressed concern that the easterly house makes some things much more difficult. If you look at existing lot and where the house is and the side clearances, there is simply more room to the lot line on westerly side of house than on the easterly side. His problem arising from review of the model and the drawings is the rhythm created by these constraints. He sees the easterly house impacting, detracting from, and being detrimental to the existing structure. The existing house is unique and has a special siting on lot that are important to the house itself. He feels that the house to left is not as offensive, but the house to right seems too close. In sum, he personally could see (1) something to left, especially if scaled down. He suggested that elimination of overhanging

rear porch would help by allowing house to move back, thus creating more setback from the existing house; (2) building an appropriate addition off the middle house; and (3) for the lot on the right perhaps a small house sized more in the neighborhood of 1200+ sf , set back at rear of property, an picking up a typical carriage house theme. Overall, that could create a campus effect while preserving space around existing house.

S Makowka summarized what he had heard from the Commission: we are not at the point where nothing should be built on this site, but also we were not at the point where we could reasonably to give a denial that included a sufficiently detail alternative suggestion for what would work as an alternative since we don't have anything close to those alternatives in front of us. B. Cohen added correction for size of the nearby houses, the floor areas of Elder Terrace houses are in the 1200, 1500, and 1600 sf.

S. Makowka summarized that it seems that something workable can probably be found, but not this specific project. Since we have to rule on application tonight absent a continuance of the hearing, he indicated that the Applicant needs to let us know how they want to move forward. Applicants asked for a minute and left room to discuss. Applicant returned and asked for extension to April 15, 2009. S. Makowka obtained signed extension.

Meeting adjourned 11:20pm

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Greeley, Executive Secretary AHDC